

United States Patent and Trademark Office

 \overline{M}

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FIL | ING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/023,207 | 12/13/2001 | | Darryl Franklin Clark | KCC-15,966 | 2652 | |
| 35844 | 7590 | 09/09/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| PAULEY P 2800 WEST | | N & ERICKSON ROAD | YAO, SAMCHUAN CUA | | | |
| HOFFMAN ESTATES, IL 60195 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | | 1733 | | |

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | ₩ | |
|------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 10/023,207 | CLARK ET AL. | : | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| Sam Chuan C. Yao | 1733 | | | |
| - | 10/023,207 Examiner | 10/023,207 CLARK ET AL. Examiner Art Unit | Application No. Applicant(s) 10/023,207 CLARK ET AL. Examiner Art Unit | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

| | | • |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| PERIO | FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | : ' |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the m | ailing date of the final rejection. | : |
| event, however, will the statutory period for reply e | te of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. EPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. Se | : |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pe 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t | 6(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extens the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2 han three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, man three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, man three months after the mailing date of the final rejection. | nsion fee under 2) as set forth in |
| • | Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in of (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | : |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be | entered because: | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would red | uire further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | : |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (s | see Note below); | : |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the appeal; and/or | plication in better form for appeal by materially reducing or sir | mplifying the |
| (d) . they present additional claims with | out canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims | S . |
| NOTE: | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the follow | wing rejection(s): | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed | amendment |
| 5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ application in condition for allowance be | request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT cause: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | r place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be constraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | dered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were tion. | e newly |
| | nendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered a claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | nd an |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) a | s follows: | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | · : |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | : |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-22. | | : |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | <u>23-26</u> . | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | |
| | Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | |
| 10. Other: See Continuation Sheet | | |
| | Pm Cliff | |
| | am Chuan C. Yao | |
| | Primary Examiner |). |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Art Unit: 1733

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Counsel's newly presented arguments are not persuasive. It is true that, none of the references explicitly state "fully" activating a binder (i.e. lower melting) component of multicomponent filaments. However, one in the art reading the applied references in their totality would have reasonably understood that the activation of a binder (i.e. lower melting) component by melting requires at least substantially completely (if not completely) the lowe melting component. Note that, the prior office action did not indicate that fully activating binder component reads partially melting binder component, but rather such reads on melting binder component. One in the art would have readily understood that the office action was intended to convey at least substantially completely (if not completely) melting binder component of multicomponent filaments to fully activate the binder component.

Continuation of 10. Other: In light of Counsel's argument on pages 7-9, a rejection based on 112 2nd paragraph is withdrawn. However Counsel's request to withdraw the finality of the prior office action is denied.